CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING IN THE MATTER OF

A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR ELLWOOD OIL DEVELOPMENT AND PIPELINE PROJECT

COPY

GOLETA COMMUNITY CENTER

ROOM 1

5679 HOLLISTER AVENUE

GOLETA, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 2006

3:00 P.M.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION
3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240, SACRAMENTO, CA 95827 / (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

Peter Strait, Project Manager
California State Lands Commission

Eric Gillies, California State Lands Commission

Steve Radis, Marine Research Specialists

Greg Chittick, Marine Research Specialists

Steve Greig, Venoco, Inc.

I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. STRAIT: Well, I think everyone knows what we're doing here today. We're here to take public commentary and to give a notice of availability for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Venoco Ellwood marine Terminal Lease Renewal Project, to give a small presentation about everything that's going on.

In regards to that, we have the consultant who's prepared the environmental document for us, from MRS.

MR. GILLIES: Introduce yourself, first.

MR. STRAIT: Oh, introduce myself, first. My name's Peter Strait, I'm the Project Manager for the California State Lands Commission for this project. I'm new to the team, so this is the first time I've done this.

And we're going to give a short presentation about what's going on. Then we're going to basically open up the floor to questions and then for public commentary. We have a meeting right now at three o'clock.

At six o'clock we're going to have a second meeting, which is going to be basically a repetition of the same thing. If you've given commentary for this meeting it will be in our records, you don't need to come back a second time, it will all go into the same file.

This meeting is for people that want to come, basically, during work hours. The six o'clock meeting is

for people that wanted to come when they get off, get home from work.

So I know there was some talk of whether public commentary was at one or the other one. We are taking public commentary at both.

If you'd like to show up for both, you're more than welcome to.

But, anyway, to give a short presentation I've got a colleague here. Would you stand up and introduce yourself, please?

MR. RADIS: Steve Radis, with Marine Research Specialists. And I've brought Greg Chittick with me to answer the hard questions.

We put together a real brief overview of the project and the EIR that I'll go through, for those that probably haven't read the whole document.

EIR contains -- actually, what we're going to do is cover the contents of the EIR, a little background information on this project, the project description, a summary of some of the impacts, the more significant impacts with the project, some of the alternatives that we evaluated, and then talk a little bit about the environment alternatives.

Well, we evaluated pretty much the entire list of required elements, issue areas in the EIR. About the first

half-dozen are by far the most important. They're the geological resources, looking at issues like geo hazards, natural seeps in the area, which have a certain impact on the baseline.

Obviously, hazards, hazardous materials. The issue there being the oil spills, that's our probably biggest impact.

Air quality/public health. This facility has got a rather high health impact rating by the Air Pollution Control District and in the past there have been some odor complaint issues, so we looked at that.

Water resources. We're really concerned with marine water quality and, again, impacts from oil spills and operations at the terminal.

And then biological resources, again, is related to oil spills.

We hit on the rest of the issue areas, but we consider them probably a little less important than the top half-dozen.

The EIR has been broken down into, I guess, five chapters. We've got an executive summary, followed by impact summary tables, kind of the snapshot of most of the document. Introduction, project description. We did an alternative screening analysis and then we've got a sizeable chapter on project alternative and cumulative impact

analysis.

In preparing the document we followed the basic CEQA guidelines. We looked at the project description, developed the environmental setting. We've conducted a screening analysis of alternatives to the project. We developed a list of cumulative projects that could have impacts that overlap with this particular project.

We then assessed the impacts to the project, and alternatives and cumulative projects, and then screened those and ranked the projects in terms of which one would be environmentally preferred.

Impacts are classified as class one for a significant impact that can't be mitigated or feasibly mitigated. A class two impact is one that prior to mitigation is significant, but can be mitigated to a level that would be less in our criteria.

Class three impacts are considered those that are adverse, but not necessarily significant.

And then class four, beneficial impacts. Occasionally, the project will actually have a benefit environmentally.

Basically, the project doesn't require a lot in terms of physical changes. It's to extend the lease for an additional ten-year period, which would end in February of 2013. And I'm sure most people, adding it up, know that ten

years from now is not 2013, but it's retroactive to the last least expiration.

And Eric, I'm not sure of then, a year or month-to-month?

MR. GILLIES: On the lease?

MR. RADIS: Yeah.

MR. GILLIES: What would that be? The question is, is that a year-to-year leave or a month-to-month?

MR. GREIG: Right now?

MR. GILLIES: Right now.

MR. GREIG: Year-to-year.

MR. RADIS: Year-to-year, okay. And basically, with the marine terminal, given the current infrastructure, it would -- you know, it prevents Venoco from basically using truck transport to get their oil to market, and since right now there are no pipelines in the area that can transport oil.

An overview of the project. This is Coal Oil Point right here. This is the Coal Oil Point Reserve. These are the terminal moorings. The pipeline comes ashore to the two storage tanks, traverses through Goleta, on out to the Ellwood onshore facility, which is pretty close to the Bacara Hotel.

For those that are familiar, there's also the PRC 421 Pier is right next to the Sandpiper Golf Course, which

are not part of this project, but clearly a cumulative impact analysis issue.

The pipeline -- or the terminal was actually constructed in 1929. I don't think anybody here remembers that. It's about .7 miles northwest of Coal Oil Point, as is showed.

The onshore facilities, the tanks are located on UCSB property. That lease expires in 2016, about three years after the lease for this project would expire.

There is an offshora lease about 2,600 feet and, currently, the barge loads about 25 times per year. And basically, most of the deliveries go to the Port of Los Angeles, Port of Long Beach complex for local refineries there. There are occasional deliveries to the San Francisco Bay Area.

Offshore facilities include about a 2,600-foot-long pipeline. It's 12 inches onshore, 10 inches diameter offshore. The end of the pipeline has a 240-foot rubber hose that is used to connect to the barge.

There's a six-point mooring system, which is shown on the figure, as well as a couple other buoys that hold the loading hose.

Onshore, there's two 65,000-barrel crude oil storage tanks. They're a floating roof design, with a fixed roof on top of that. There's a 10,000-barrel fire water

tank.

There's a pump house with two pumps that allows this project to load at about 2,400 barrels per hour, maximum. And then there's an onshore control room with switchgear monitoring gear, and a then a city water pipeline.

Prior to any mitigation, we identified significant impacts for geological resources, hazardous materials, air quality/public health, marine water quality, biological resources, cultural resources, land use and recreation, and aesthetics in visual resources.

The majority of these impacts are all caused by oil spill potential.

I have, now, three slides in a row that talk about significant mitigation that had been proposed as part of the draft EIR. The first one is to monitor the marine loading line. I know the issue's been brought up on more than one occasion, how this line has been exposed after winter storms, there's been coating removed, potential damage. So we have as one aspect of the mitigation is to inspect after winter storms. Basically, support the pipeline, if there's free spans where the sand has been eroded underneath it, and then repair the line as necessary.

Obviously, when it's exposed would be the best time to make any needed repairs, instead of when it gets

covered up with sand again.

We put in a requirement for a seismic monitoring inspection and repair program. These facilities have been around for a while, since 1929, and these storage tanks are pretty old and we have some concerns about seismic impact, so we've got that requirement to really closely monitor these tanks and upgrade, as required.

There have been issues with odor in the past, with the facility, and a lot of that has been related to the crude oil tanks and the sulfur content, specifically hydrogen sulfide.

We proposed a limit on the crude oil content of hydrogen sulfide to minimize the potential public health impacts.

We've got another big issue measure for crude oil tank maintenance inspection and seismic retrofit.

And then another mitigation measure addresses the issue of detecting potential spills in the loading line, and that measure would require flow meters on both ends of the line so that the flow could be balanced, and if there's any kind of leakage in the line it would be detected fairly rapidly.

Currently, it's more of a visual inspection on the barge side and a little less than accurate in terms of detecting, you know, mainly a small leak. Obviously, a

rupture it would detect because no oil would arrive, but anything short of that would be difficult.

We've got a requirement to operate the pipeline in vacuum mode. In the event of a pipeline failure, you'd basically pull the oil back towards the terminal.

Another requirement would be to pre-boom the barge, which essentially means surround the barge with oil spill booms so that in the event of a spill the booms would already be in place, instead of trying to respond after the fact.

Non-destructive inspection and testing of the marine loading line. Again, the loading line has been there for a long time, it's been subjected to a lot of external forces. Non-destructive testing would help identify areas where there could be weaknesses in pipeline.

Drain protection for the onshore facilities. There is some potential for spills to actually get outside of containment and affect the Devereaux Slough.

Oil spill drills, actually getting out there and deploying the equipment so that the responders had experience in deploying and responding to oil spills, instead of trying to do it on the fly.

And then a requirement to go to a double-hulled barge by 2010. There's actually an international requirement to go to double-hulled tankers by 2015. And by

2010 it already requires double-sided or double-bottomed. We thought it appropriate at this point to go to a double-hulled barge.

Another requirement for air quality, to minimize potential air quality impacts, would be to reduce vessel emissions, shut down engines when they're not needed, instead of being in an idle mode.

We felt there's a need to install vapor control devices on the crude oil storage tanks. Again, that addresses both odors and air quality impacts.

Proximity switches on the barge, whether it's Jovalan, or another barge, to detect elevated pressure within the barge storage tanks, so that the pressure relief valves don't lift and vent hydrocarbons to the atmosphere. The proximity switch would detect that and they could shut the pumps down before that.

We requested revisions to their Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans, and Oil Spill Contingency Plans, really looking at doing a more thorough evaluation of potential spills and increasing, essentially, operator training and response.

We've also requested that vessel operations are limited to established corridors, which I'm sure most of them are already, but we want to make sure that that's codified for all vessels.

In terms of addressing biological impacts, we felt a need for training for the barge and tug operators in recognizing marine mammals, as well as having marine mammal observers during the migration season.

And them more upgrades to the oil spill contingency plan to look at things like habitat, specific site-specific issues and clean up.

I'll give you an example, after the Exxon Valdez oil spill some of the more significant damage to the ecosystems were caused by the clean up, not the oil spill. In fact, we have a contract with them, that we're still studying recovery of the environment in Prince William Sound.

We've actually also requested that they address archeological issues in the Oil Spill Contingency Plan, so that there aren't any site disturbances or pilfering of archeological sites nearby.

In spite of the proposed mitigation, we still feel that we have five areas where we have significant impacts. Again, it's hazardous materials, marine water quality, biological resources, land use plan and recreation, and aesthetics/visual resources. Again, that is almost all oil spill related.

We did oil spill modeling, both looking at the probabilities and accumulations. It's clear that a spill in

the vicinity of the terminal would impact a wide area in the Santa Barbara Channel, depending on the currents at the time. It would also impact marine sanctuaries in the area, marine park protected areas.

Along the barge route, the barge passes either through or adjacent to the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary, as well as the Farallon Island Marine Sanctuary, and the Channel Islands Marine Sanctuary. So no matter which way the barge goes, it's going either through or in close proximities to what we consider pretty sensitive areas.

As part of, as I mentioned before, we did an alternative screening analysis, looking at what other alternatives Venoco could use to essentially transport the oil. We came up with a list of alternatives. We then screened those alternatives in terms of feasibility, potential environmental impacts, and then selected a smaller range to do a full analysis on.

We eliminated three different alternatives. The first one was a unit train. There are a lot of reasons we eliminated that, one is feasibility. There's really not available space to build a railroad spur and bring a train in for crude transport. Not to mention environmental impacts, noise, air quality. I think bringing a unit train into the area would be considered a nuisance on both sides of the facility.

An earlier Venoco application for their full-fuel development identified an offshore pipeline to Ventura County. We eliminated that alternative for environmental reasons. It's entirely feasible, technically, but it would pass through or adjacent to, again, marine sanctuaries, and having an offshore pipeline for that distance substantially increases the likelihood of a spill in the marine environment.

We also eliminated an offshore pipeline to Las Flores Canyon, which was where the Exxon Santa Ynez unit is located and is the terminus of the All American Pipeline.

Again, we do not feel that an offshore pipeline was beneficial to the current project.

We came up with two alternatives in the EIR which we both consider part of the no-project alternative that would be a mode of transportation that Venoco would have to utilize in the event that the lease were denied.

The first is a pipeline alternative. This would be an onshore pipeline from the Ellwood Onshore Facility to Las Flores Canyon and the All American Pipeline, and that's actually the pipeline that they're proposing now, as part of their full-fuel development.

The second alternative would be truck transportation, where the oil would be transported from Ellwood, and we selected the -- to minimize transportation,

dropping the oil off at the Carpinteria facility, owned by Venoco, and then using existing pipelines to Los Angeles from that point forward.

We did the environmental analysis on these alternatives, on the project, and under CEQA, when the known project alternative is environmentally superior which clearly, in most cases it is, when it comes to oil transportation, you identify the next alternative.

Well, in this case we don't really have another alternative, it's either the project or the no project, meaning pipeline or truck transportation.

Based on the analysis we did decide that pipeline transportation would be environmentally preferred over the offshore marine terminal, and definitely over trucking.

And questions and comments at this point?

MR. GILLIES: Yeah, before we get to questions, I just want you to notice all the microphones here that are recording the meeting, so we have an accurate record of this. And if you haven't done so, we have a sign-up sheet. And then, if you could, if you have a question, go to the podium and that way we can record it.

And then after questions, we'll go ahead and open it to public testimony.

MR. SMITH: Hi, just a quick question. Was status quo ever considered as an alternative? I mean, maintaining

just as it is right now? The same amount of flow, the same amount -- so no new drilling, but the same amount of --

MR. RADIS: Actually, this product is status quo. This is --

MR. SMITH: Oh, this is not the 40 new --

MR. RADIS: No.

MR. STRAIT: This is for the continuation of the existing lease, under the existing terms.

MR. RADIS: Right.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. RADIS: The proposed project for full-fuel development would actually get rid of this facility, that's part of the proposal. So they're kind of almost merged together in terms of timing, which is unfortunate.

MR. GILLIES: Yeah, we had a notice of preparation meeting, I believe it was July. Do you remember, Steve?

MR. GREIG: Yeah.

MR. GILLIES: Yeah, and we met here and took public comment on preparing the document that will be forthcoming. And we're right now on the phase of hiring a consultant. And what we plan to do is come back, after the consultant's on board, to have another public meeting, introduce who we selected as a consultant to help us prepare the document, and then any other developments since that public meeting. And we'll send out a public notice for

that.

And it's not going to be so formal, we just want to give like a project update to the community.

THE REPORTER: Can you folks please identify yourselves when you speak or ask a question, please? Thank you.

MR. SANGSTER: Sure. My name is David Sangster, I live in the area.

You mentioned the non-destructive testing and also the monitoring of the marine line during the winter storms. Usually, the winter storms occur, they find out about the exposure months later from the public. You know, they seem to miss being there at the right time, at the low tide, or whatever. It would seem like something should be done now about the marine line. T-1

And I'm not sure if just non-destructive testing really entails the visual inspection that would be required from a line that has been damaged and has been -- has settled, and also has gone through a lot of free-spanning that has not been brought up to its original position. T-2

So I guess the basic question is what kind of non-destructive testing is going to substitute in place of a visual inspection.

MR. RADIS: Actually, we require both. We're requiring both non-destructive inspection and a visual

inspection after every storm.

MR. SANGSTER: No, but I'm talking about a current inspection of the current condition right now. It hasn't been exposed since '98. They thought that it would be exposed every year, they were going to do inspections then, but it hasn't been exposed. When you're waiting for the big, big storm that would re-expose it, and you're asking for a catastrophe because that line is now damaged. It was damaged in '98. But it seems like before the lease renewal takes place, you should have a visual inspection. You know, repair the damage, rewrap the sections that have lost their wrap, you know, replace sections that might be replacing, but not put it off until, you know, possibly the next time it's exposed.

T-3

MR. RADIS: So dig it up, you mean and --

MR. SANGSTER: A visual inspection, yes, you dig it down and look at it 360 degrees.

MR. RADIS: Okay.

MR. SANGSTER: You know, test the metal, not just with the biologist looking at it.

MR. RADIS: Right.

MR. GREIG: Yeah, the non-destructive testing that we're contemplating would be from the inside out and would look at the integrity of the pipeline and identify anomalies of the line.

MR. SANGSTER: Using a smart pig?

MR. GREIG: Essentially, a smart pig, yeah.

MR. SANGSTER: The line has been -- they cannot send a smart pig down there, that's what we've been told for years.

MR. GREIG: Well --

MR. SANGSTER: It's impossible.

MR. GREIG: -- we've inspected it.

MR. RADIS: You inspect, yeah.

MR. SANGSTER: Internally.

MR. RADIS: Yeah, I think it can be, if it absolutely needs to be done.

MR. SANGSTER: I agree that scientifically there's probably the technology --

MR. RADIS: Well, with modification it can be inspected.

MR. SANGSTER: Well, we've been told that no internal testing has been done because it can't be done because of the damage in the pipeline.

The same thing with the gull, they were going to do the gull in place of a visual test. They did the first test in 2002, came back in 2003, they finally saw the pictures of the line when it was exposed and realized there were bends in it that they had not been able to measure past the first bend, you know, the section that had been exposed

in '96, and again in '98, when it lost its coating.

MR. RADIS: Right.

MR. SANGSTER: There's a few blind spots out there that haven't been seen, you know, since '98.

MR. RADIS: Okay.

MR. STRAIT: Are there any other questions related to the presentation or the environmental document?

All right, then let's move on. I've got a few speaker slips here, from people that want to give public comment.

Is there anyone else that has filled out a green slip and has not yet turned it in? Have we got them all?

MR. RADIS: I think you've got one for everyone.

MR. STRAIT: All right. Then the first on the list is Michael H. Smith, from the Gray Whales Count.

MR. SMITH: Hi. My name is Michael H. Smith, and I am Project Coordinator of Gray Whales Count, a joint research and education project of the American Cetacean Society-Channel Islands, in California and Cascadia Research Collective, Olympia, Washington.

While I have only just begun to examine this draft EIR, I will address specific issues in writing at a later time. Now, however, I want to offer to share, through whatever means is practical, our data and observations from scientific surveys to more fully represent current marine-

mammal activity in the area of the Venoco project.

Our primary research objective is to create baseline data from Coal Oil Point, in the Santa Barbara Channel, through annual surveys of the northbound migration of gray whales in order to assess the use and nature of what may be a critical corridor for the whales through this region. Furthermore, we intend to share our data with a network of observation stations along the California coast and, through combined analysis, our data may help to distinguish route choices and possibly allow for more accurate assessments of events that affect gray whales. They are no longer listed as endangered, yet they remain a population at risk.

Our initial survey in 2005 spanned 100 days, from January 29th through May 8th. Weather permitting, we were on station six hours a day, seven days a week. In 2006, we expanded our coverage to eight hours per day, from January 28th through May 14th, 107 days.

Through comparative analysis of our 2006 count, we estimated that 2,833 gray whales, including 618 calves, migrated north through the nearshore of the Santa Barbara Channel, past Coal Oil Point.

In addition, we saw 34 southbound gray whales, including a calf born enroute, further up the California coast. Incidentally, one of these southbounders breached

five times in front of Coal Oil Point. Two and a half hours later, past Santa Barbara Point, it breached again and landed on a boat.

We also observed many resident animals and visitors that depend upon the Channel resources for food. We saw bottlenose dolphins almost every day. In March, April, and May we saw humpback whales near and beyond Platform Holly, and on 12 days we saw a sea otter, usually in the kelp off Isla Vista.

A pair of harbor seals were regular visitors to the Point throughout the year's survey, and we saw many, many sea lions resting on the barge buoys and foraging in the waters around Coal Oil Point.

A surprise was a northern elephant seal bobbing in the surf right in front of us.

It is apparent that this is a very rich feeding area for all these animals, including migrating gray whales, which have been observed feeding on mysids in the kelp. The shelter is vital to some. We regularly see calves nursing on all sides of the Point, particularly towards Sands and Ellwood beaches, where the calves are enjoying habitat resources.

Here, a great deal of the life depends on these resources and has, to a degree, coexisted until now with recreational, commercial, and industrial development of the

area.

The gray whales and marine mammals are the focus of our research and we take not of hazards and threats to their well being. Accordingly, we make note of behavior changes or, in some cases, no behavior change.

Presently, our research does not include acoustic sampling, and so we have not been able to quantify the impact of noise, but it must be considerable.

We've seen all types of vessels, from kayaks to research ships, kelp harvesters to lobster boats, jet skis to Venoco's oil barge. Just about every day we recorded whale watching boats and crew boats servicing the oil platform. And on at least two occasions we watched those crew boats doing a little whale watching with loads of non-crew passengers. We also watched helicopters purposely hovering under 100 feet above whales, dolphins, and sea lions.

Some activity is clearly harassment. Some is probably unintentional. It appears that some people do not know the animals are there.

My records of the oil barge are unofficial, but I noted the barge off Coal Oil Point only five times during our 15-week survey. The EIR says that during the same period there could be 25 barge transports and that is an enormous increase.

Between the buoys, the barge is a formidable presence, and it may be more so arriving and departing, with powerful support vessels effectively dominating the passage between Holly and the shore and blocking the path of the migration through the nearshore.

It is believed that a reasons gray whale calves choose the naarshore to escort their calves north is avoidance of killer whales. In April, a cow/calf pair, swimming through the mid-Channel, was attacked by a p od of killer whales, just five or so miles offshore of Holly.

With substantially increased barge traffic in the nearshore, combined with active drilling, surely one result will be more gray whales detouring outside Holly, into the range of killer whales.

Increased oil production does require additional means to capture and transport oil. More oil flowing through the pipelines and/or ferried by barges through the nearshore seems to increase the risk of a catastrophic spill in the area that serves as a major migration path for gray whales. It is an area teeming with wildlife, including protected marine mammals, dependent upon these resources for food and habitat.

Thank you for this opportunity and I look forward to sharing our data.

MR. STRAIT: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

All right, the next speaker slip I have is for a Connie Hannah, representing the League of Women Voters.

MS. HANNAH: A battery of microphones. Which one do I use.

MR. STRAIT: The big one.

MS. HANNAH: Thank you. I'm Connie Hannah, speaking for the Santa Barbara League of Women Voters. The League is very pleased that the State Lands Commission is conducting this hearing in Goleta, today. We hope that the future lease renewal can also be heard here, so that local people, who have been long involved, can comment on it.

This appears to be a thorough, readable draft. For the non-technical reader, it's quite obvious that the no project alternative, using onshore pipeline transport, is the environmentally superior choice. It would reduce all of the Class I impacts. That is shown clearly on Table ES-2, which compares the impacts from continued use of the EMT with the preferred alternative.

T-4 We do not think that the truck transportation project could ever be approved, because both the State and the county now require that all oil be transported by pipeline. With the serious congestion on Highway 101, we do not believe that any local government could approve trucking this crude oil to Carpinteria. The League has consistently supported pipeline transport of all oil products, and we

would certainly do so in this case.

The League has long been asking for a termination of the Ellwood Marine Terminal. The dangers to the ocean waters and the Channel resources from using the barge are obvious. Your charts that you recently put on the board, that show the possible impacts of a spill on the resources of the Channel and the coastline are very good.

The onshore components were constructed in the 1920's and they have required many repairs. In the meantime, this entire area has been built up and includes the very sensitive population of young children that you mention in the Draft EIR. However, you do not mention the fact that this population would be almost impossible to evacuate quickly in case of explosion and fire from the EMT. T-5

Although the UCSB Child Care Center and the Isla Vista Elementary School are outside the direct hazardous footprint for the EMT, we still think that they could easily be affected by an accident there because they are not much more than a mile away. T-6

In addition, as noted in the EIR, UCSB plans to build additional faculty and study housing very near this industrial site, very soon.

The League considers it important that, in spite of any proposed mitigations, the renewal of this project continues to have serious, unmitigatable Class I impacts.

Thank you.

MR. STRAIT: Thank you, Mrs. Hannah.

Oh, just to let people know, if there are written versions or copies of what you have presented to us, that we can accept those as well.

MR. GILLIES: And, also, if you plan to do write-in comments, the close of the comment period is September 13th -- or 15th.

MR. STRAIT: 15th.

MR. GILLIES: Sorry. It's a Friday. So we'll be accepting written comments up to that point.

MR. STRAIT: And one thing to note is that that 4:00 p.m. deadline is when we have to receive it. So postmarked documents, received after that, we cannot include.

The next card that I have is for a David Sangster, that is a resident of the area.

MR. SANGSTER: My name is David Sangster and I do live in the Ellwood area, and I do go down to the beach there quite often. I have a fairly long letter that I haven't quite finished, yet, but I'll just summarize some of the points.

You know, I have several what I would call red flags, like six red flags, concerning the pipeline that extends from the edge of the sand bluff through the

intertidal zone and partially through the surf zone. That's the part that I've observed, or have considered, or have concerns about.

My concerns relate to, one, you know, the freespan. You know, at one time they felt that 90 feet was safe. That number has since been reduced down to 30 feet for that section of pipeline because of the bends.

My estimate shows roughly 55 feet of freespan in the photos of 98.

The gull tests estimates or gives the length of that section at close to a hundred feet. I don't believe it's that long, but I have a picture showing essentially the whole length in freespan. So, you know, I would guess it's probably closer to 50 feet. Even the gull test for the section that they did make measurements on is not very conclusive.

The settling issue, the next section between the bends and at the second bend, that I observed and photographed in '96 and '98, shows basically that most of the settling occurred during the February storm of '98. Back then I estimated, just from the photos, like three or even four feet of settling.

The county responded in writing, to my comments at that time, this is a letter to Jim Norris from Jay Sheth, dated June 23rd, 1999 and, you know, there are several